

providers, while engaged in a national franchise as proposed by the bill would be required to pay each franchise authority six percent of their gross revenues as a fee to support use of local rights-of-way and local Public Education Government channels. This payment was seen as an unfunded mandate.

However, under all franchise agreements across the country, companies are required to pay this type of fee in some form. It is not something newly mandated. I believe that the bill merely continues, and in most estimates, could exceed, the current flow of money from cable providers to local franchise authorities. In doing this, I believe the bill's authors intended to make sure that cities would not lose revenue they counted on from local franchise agreements, and I fully support that cause.

Due to this, I would have supported the opportunity to consider H.R. 5252, so that a true debate could continue on the underlying provisions of the bill.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. SPENCER BACHUS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2006*

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I was inadvertently detained and missed rollcall votes No. 251–254. Had I been present I would have voted “aye” on each.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER  
AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT  
ON H.R. 4939, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE, THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR, AND HURRICANE RECOVERY, 2006

SPEECH OF

### HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 12, 2006*

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for this defense supplemental without hesitation, but with a number of concerns.

As I've said in the past, I opposed the resolution authorizing the use of force in Iraq because I thought President Bush's decision to begin military action in Iraq was premature. I thought it would have been better to allow more time for other measures, including coercive inspections, to accomplish the goal of disarming Saddam Hussein. However, Congress—by adopting the resolution authorizing the use of force—left it to the President to decide if and when military action would begin.

But with our troops still in the field, actively engaged in operations that Congress has authorized, we have an obligation to fund those operations. I won't make our soldiers the victims of my regrets by failing to support this bill to provide them what they need to carry out those operations.

It's too bad the Republican leadership evidently didn't see the urgency in getting this funding to our troops to pay for key equipment and benefits. The president requested this funding back in February, but somehow the Republican leadership couldn't get it done until

now. In the interim, the Army was forced to cut back on ordering spare parts and supplies and freeze civilian hires, among other constraints.

So I'm glad we're finally focusing on this legislation today, which includes funding for military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as funding to train and equip the military and police forces of those countries. I'm pleased that the conference report funds more up-armored Humvees, provides nearly \$2 billion to procure and develop countermeasures to prevent improvised explosive device attacks on our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, and funds the recently enhanced \$100,000 death benefit for soldiers' families.

I'm also pleased that—more than 9 months after Hurricane Katrina struck—the conference report includes funding for levee improvements and for Community Development Block Grants for the Gulf Coast States. The report also includes important funding for pandemic flu preparedness and for border security.

I do have strong concerns about some things that are in this conference report and some things that were left out.

I am disappointed that it does not include the additional funds that the Senate approved for work to reduce the increased danger of severe wildfires in Colorado forests caused by prolonged drought and insect infestations.

After the Senate acted, I wrote the House conferees to point out that these factors have raised to emergency levels the risk to our communities. I noted that hazardous-fuel reduction projects can reduce that risk, and our State has hazardous fuels projects waiting to be implemented but lacking adequate funding to do so. Unfortunately, the conferees did not include in the conference report the Senate-passed increase to the National Forest System to reduce the risk of catastrophic fires and mitigate the effects of widespread insect infestation.

I am also disappointed that the conference report does not include language prohibiting permanent military bases in Iraq. The House-passed bill contained a provision that I supported—H. Amdt. 750—which would ensure that no funds in the bill would be used to enter into a base agreement with the government of Iraq. The Senate-passed bill also contained a similar amendment—S. Amdt. 3855—which would prohibit funds to establish permanent military bases in Iraq or to exercise control over the oil infrastructure or oil resources of Iraq.

But the conference report includes neither version of this language, which I find baffling, since the clear will of both bodies was expressed through the passage of these amendments. Policymakers and experts across the political spectrum agree that the U.S. should make clear that it does not seek a permanent military presence in Iraq. GEN. George Casey has testified that gradually lowering the visibility of U.S. troops will remove one of the elements fueling the insurgency. And Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld has testified that, “We have no desire to have our forces permanently in that country. We have no plans or no discussions under way to have permanent bases in that country.” I believe that Congress should have joined the administration in affirming this principle to send a clear signal to the Iraqi people that we fully support their efforts to establish democracy and exercise sovereignty.

Finally, I believe the administration must begin to take responsibility for the full cost of the war in Iraq and consider these costs through the regular appropriations process. With the enactment of this supplemental, Defense Department spending for operations in Afghanistan and Iraq will reach \$400 billion, with the majority of that provided for Iraq. Even though we are now more than 3 years into the conflict, virtually all of this money has been provided for Iraq as “emergency” funding and has not been offset. But there is no “emergency” here. So much of the costs are predictable. Instead, by funding this war through supplementals, the Bush administration avoids having to make tough choices—like raising taxes or making deep spending cuts. The American people deserve greater candor from the administration about both the predictable costs as well as the anticipated benefits of our undertakings in Iraq. I've attached a May editorial from the Rocky Mountain News that amplifies this point.

Nonetheless, as I said, I will vote for this bill without hesitation because its prompt passage is needed not just to support our men and women in uniform as they fight, but also to continue to lay the foundation for the harder mission of stabilizing Iraq.

[From the Rocky Mountain News, May 4, 2006]

#### A CRAZY WAY TO FUND THE WARS: IRAQ SPENDING IS NO LONGER AN ‘EMERGENCY’

A congressional emergency spending measure is meant to be a quick response to sudden, unexpected and generally one-time events, the Gulf Coast hurricanes being an excellent example. The emergency bills are handled outside the regular budget process and under much looser rules.

The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, although obviously serious, hardly qualify as emergencies in the normal sense. Yet that is how the Bush administration and Congress insist on funding them, even though we're in our fifth year on one and fourth year on the other.

The result is that Congress has a poor grip on the wars' costs and how they fit in with other competing budget priorities. And the process has allowed Congress to avoid the question of how we are going to pay for those wars.

The Senate took advantage of the urgency of the latest emergency funding bill for Iraq, Afghanistan and hurricane relief to load it up with money for Hawaiian sugar growers, a Northrop Grumman shipyard, riverbank erosion in California and farm relief, among other largesse. A \$92 billion bill is now around \$108 billion.

The wars are not going away. The president himself has indicated we are likely to be in Iraq at least another 3½ years. Its annual cost has risen from \$51 billion in 2003 to \$102 billion this year, and the meter is running at about \$9 billion a month. In a few weeks the total will surpass \$320 billion, and Congress' analysts estimate that even if troop withdrawals begin this year, a best-case scenario, the costs of a phase-out in Iraq and Afghanistan will run an additional \$371 billion.

As was done in previous wars, the expected cost of Iraq and Afghanistan should be submitted as part of the regular annual federal budget, and Congress should give it the regular line-by-line scrutiny it gives every other part of the budget. This might have prevented the squandering in Iraq of the vast sums meant for reconstruction.

Congressional researchers complain that the Pentagon has refused to give them data

on current and cumulative cost obligations for the wars as well as one-year and five-year estimates. In the normal budget process, the Pentagon would have to provide those figures.

Incorporating war costs in the regular budget, Congress would no longer be able to compartmentalize, treating those expenditures as an aberration while going about business as usual elsewhere. Those expenditures are no aberration, and it's not business as usual.

### "BLUSTER BACKFIRES"

#### HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2006*

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, anyone who doubts the wisdom of the constitutional requirement that important officials be confirmed by the Senate before taking up their jobs should ponder the disastrous example of John Bolton, whom the Senate declined to confirm as Ambassador to the U.N., and who received a recess appointment from President Bush. His tenure has been disastrous, leading to a diminution of American influence and a failure to accomplish legitimate American goals.

Like many other Americans, I greatly regretted the fact that Deputy Secretary General Mark Malloch Brown recently gave a speech strongly critical of America's role regarding the U.N., but my regret was aimed not at Mr. Brown for giving the speech, but at the Bush administration, and specifically Ambassador Bolton, for actions that led to the speech. As a Member of Congress, I am troubled by the fact that I have to agree with the substance of a speech so sharply critical of our Government, but I believe that Mr. Brown did us a service in speaking out, because it may alert my colleagues in Congress and the American people in general of the need to press for a change in the disastrous policies that Ambassador Bolton pursues in the President's name.

In the Washington Post on Monday, June 12, Sebastian Mallaby wrote a thoughtful and persuasive piece about the Bolton record. Because the current situation regarding our representation of the U.N. does so much damage to legitimate American interests, Sebastian Mallaby's column is particularly welcome and I hope will be strongly considered by President Bush, Secretary Rice, and other policy makers in this administration. It is also very important for those of us in Congress to understand his points and I ask that his column be printed here.

[From the Washington Post, June 12, 2006]

AT THE U.N., BLUSTER BACKFIRES

(By Sebastian Mallaby)

Last month President Bush issued a rare apology. "Saying 'Bring it on,' kind of tough talk, you know, that sent the wrong signal," he confessed. "I think in certain parts of the world it was misinterpreted."

Well done, Mr. President, you've understood that bluster can backfire. Now how about sharing this insight with your ambassador to the United Nations?

John R. Bolton, the ambassador in question, has a rich history of losing friends and failing to influence people. He was notorious, even before arriving at the United Nations last year, for having said that 10 stories of

the U.N. headquarters could be demolished without much loss; he had described the United States as the sun around which lesser nations rotate—mere "asteroids," he'd branded them. Perhaps not surprisingly, the Senate refused to confirm Bolton as U.N. ambassador. "Arrogant," "bullying," and "the poster child of what someone in the diplomatic corps should not be," Sen. George Voinovich called him.

Bush sent Bolton anyway, bypassing the Senate by appointing him during a congressional recess. It soon turned out that dismissing foreign ambassadors as asteroid dwellers was merely a warm-up. As soon as Bolton got to New York, he blew up the preparatory negotiations for a gathering of heads of state, insisting that the other 190 members of the world body immediately agree to hundreds of changes in the summit document.

If Bolton had picked a fight on a worthwhile issue, this might have been justified. But one of the chief aims of his edits was to eliminate all mention of the anti-poverty Millennium Development Goals, even though these targets for reducing child mortality and so on are inoffensive. After a week of Bolton-induced bureaucratic battles, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice weighed in, explaining that the administration actually had nothing against the development goals. When the summit convened, Bush himself had to declare during his speech that he supported the targets that his ambassador had repudiated.

Bolton's next triumph was to demand U.N. reform, or rather to pretend to do so. An effort to create a credible human rights council was underway, but Bolton skipped nearly all of the 30 or so negotiating sessions. Then, when the negotiators produced a blueprint for the new council, Bolton declared it unacceptable, leaving furious American allies to wonder why he hadn't weighed in earlier to secure a better outcome. "The job now is to get clarity on what the U.S. wants," the British ambassador said icily. But what Bolton really wanted was quite clear: to allow the negotiations to falter and then to condemn whatever they produced, throwing red meat to his U.N.-hating allies on the right of the Republican Party.

Next, Bolton blundered into U.N. management reform, an issue that may soon precipitate a crisis. The top U.N. officials, led by Secretary General Kofi Annan, had laid out a menu of radical changes, designed to eliminate useless conferences and reports and to move staff to departments that most needed them. Bolton added his own brand of bluster to this plan: If poor countries carried on resisting management reforms, rich countries would stop paying for the organization. The deadline for agreeing on reform is the end of this month, but no breakthrough is in sight. Officials are wondering what to do if U.N. checks start bouncing.

Not many reformers at the United Nations believe that the budget threat achieved anything. To the contrary, Bolton has so poisoned the atmosphere that the cause of management renewal is viewed by many developing countries as an American plot. And if Bolton carries through on his threat to cut off money for the United Nations, the United States will be more isolated than ever. Refusing to fund U.N. officials who are planning for a peacekeeping mission in Darfur is not a winning strategy.

Last week the U.N. deputy secretary general, a pro-American Briton named Mark Malloch Brown, went public with his Bolton frustrations. He pointed out that the United Nations serves many American objectives, from deploying peacekeepers to helping with Iraq's elections. Given this cooperation, the powers that be in Washington should stick

up for the United Nations rather than threatening to blow it up. They should not be passive in the face of "unchecked U.N.-bashing and stereotyping."

This merely stated the obvious. If you doubt that U.N.-bashing and stereotyping goes on, ask yourself what gallery Bolton is playing to—or check out the latest cover of the National Rifle Association magazine, which features a wolf with U.N. logos in its eyeballs. But Malloch Brown's speech didn't seem obvious to Bolton. "This is the worst mistake by a senior U.N. official that I have seen," he thundered in response. "Even though the target of the speech was the United States, the victim, I fear, will be the United Nations."

Which would suit Bolton and his allies perfectly. But it should not suit Bush, at least not now that he's grasped that bluster can backfire. Arriving at the U.N. summit last September, a different Bush greeted the secretary general and gestured at Bolton; "has the place blown up since he's been here?" he demanded, teasingly. Well, it's now time for the new Bush to acknowledge that Bolton's tactics aren't funny. The United States needs an ambassador who can work with the United Nations. Right now, it doesn't have one.

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

#### HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2006*

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 12, 2006, I was unavoidably detained due to a prior obligation.

I request that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reflect that had I been present and voting, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall No. 251: "yes" on agreeing to H. Res. 804; rollcall No. 252: "yes" on agreeing to H. Res. 794; rollcall No. 253: "yes" on agreeing to H. Res. 608; rollcall No. 254: "yes" on agreeing to H. Con. Res. 338; rollcall No. 255: "no" on agreeing to the previous question during consideration of H. Res. 857.

### HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL DONALD P. LAUZON ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE UNITED STATES ARMY

#### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 13, 2006*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my dear friend LTC Donald P. Lauzon as he retires from a distinguished career in the U.S. Army and as the Commander of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for the Detroit District.

Born in Rhode Island and earning his Bachelor of Science from Rhode Island College, LTC Lauzon was commissioned into the Army in 1986. He served bravely overseas in Bosnia, in Iraq, and as the Company Executive Officer of the 547th Combat Engineer Battalion in Germany. Before arriving in Detroit, LTC Lauzon served as Chief of the Department of Military Training, National Geospatial and Intelligence Agency at Fort Belvoir in Virginia. His military awards and decorations include the Bronze Star, the National Defense